



*Eden Environmental Citizen's Group, LLC*

June 29, 2019

Via US Mail, Certified USPS Tracking No 9407 1118 9956 1485 7679 21

Matthew Alden  
Operations Manager  
Core-Mark International, Inc.  
31300 Medallion Drive  
Hayward, CA 94544

Via US Mail

CT Corporation System  
Agent for service  
Core-Mark International, Inc.  
RREEF Management LLC  
818 West Seventh Street - Suite 930  
Los Angeles, California 90017

Eric J. Rolheiser  
Core-Mark International  
500 Solana Blvd. Suite 3400  
Westlake, Texas 76262

Christopher M. Miller  
Core-Mark International, Inc.  
395 Oyster Point Blvd Ste 415  
S. San Francisco, CA 94080

Pierre Cherki  
RREEF Mgmt/RREEF America LLC  
31300 Medallion Drive CA LP  
222 South Riverside Plaza, 26<sup>th</sup> Fl  
Chicago, IL 60606

---

2151 Salvio Street #A2-319  
Telephone: 925-732-0960  
Website:

Concord, CA 94520



Email: [edenenvcitizens@gmail.com](mailto:edenenvcitizens@gmail.com)  
**edenenvironmental.org**

**Re: 60-Day Notice of Violations and Intent to File Suit Under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (“Clean Water Act”)**

To Officers, Directors, Operators, Property Owners and/or Facility Managers of Core-Mark International, Inc.:

This letter is being sent to you on behalf of Eden Environmental Citizen’s Group, LLC (“EDEN”) to give legal notice that EDEN intends to file a civil action against Core-Mark International (“Discharger”) and RREEF Management/RREEF America LLC and 31300 Medallion Drive CA LP (“Property Owner”) for violations of the Federal Clean Water Act (“CWA” or “Act”) 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.*, that EDEN believes are occurring at the Core-Mark International facility located at 31300 Medallion Drive in Hayward, California (“the Facility” or “the site”).

EDEN is an environmental citizen’s group established under the laws of the State of California to protect, enhance, and assist in the restoration of all rivers, creeks, streams, wetlands, vernal pools, and tributaries of California, for the benefit of its ecosystems and communities.

EDEN formally registered as a limited liability company (LLC) association with the California Secretary of State on June 22, 2018; however, since at least July 1, 2014, EDEN has existed as an unincorporated environmental citizen’s association with members who remain associated with EDEN as of the date of this Notice.

As discussed below, the Facility’s discharges of pollutants degrade water quality and harm aquatic life in the Facility’s Receiving Waters, which are waters of the United States and described in Section II.B, below. EDEN has members throughout northern California. Some of EDEN’s members live, work, and/or recreate near the Receiving Waters and use and enjoy the Receiving Waters for surfing, kayaking, camping, fishing, boating, swimming, hiking, cycling, bird watching, picnicking, viewing wildlife, and/or engaging in scientific study.

At least one of EDEN’s current members has standing to bring suit against Core-Mark International, as the unlawful discharge of pollutants from the Facility as alleged herein has had an adverse effect particular to him or her and has resulted in actual harm to the specific EDEN member(s).

Further, the Facility’s discharges of polluted storm water and non-storm water are ongoing and continuous. As a result, the interests of certain individual EDEN members have been, are being, and will continue to be adversely affected by the failure of Core-Mark International to comply with the General Permit and the Clean Water Act.

CWA section 505(b) requires that sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under CWA section 505(a), a citizen must give notice of intent to file suit. 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b).

Notice must be given to the alleged violator, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”), and the State in which the violations occur.

As required by CWA section 505(b), this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit provides notice to the Discharger of the violations which have occurred and continue to occur at the Facility. After the expiration of sixty (60) days from the date of this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit, EDEN intends to file suit in federal court against the Discharger under CWA section 505(a) for the violations described more fully below.

## **I. THE SPECIFIC STANDARD, LIMITATION, OR ORDER VIOLATED**

EDEN’s investigation of the Facility has uncovered significant, ongoing, and continuous violations of the CWA and the General Industrial Storm Water Permit issued by the State of California (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001 [State Water Resources Control Board (“SWRCB”)] Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 97-03-DWQ (“1997 Permit”) and by Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ (“2015 Permit”) (collectively, the “General Permit”).

Information available to EDEN, including documents obtained from California EPA’s online Storm Water Multiple Application and Reporting Tracking System (“SMARTS”), indicates that on or around July 24, 1995, Core-Mark International submitted a Notice of Intent (“NOI”) to be authorized to discharge storm water from the Facility. On or around January 7, 2016, Core-Mark International submitted an NOI to be authorized to discharge storm water from the Facility under the 2015 Permit. Core-Mark International’s assigned Waste Discharger Identification number (“WDID”) is 2 01I011837.

As more fully described in Section III, below, EDEN alleges that in its operations of the Facility, Core-Mark International has committed ongoing violations of the substantive and procedural requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act, California Water Code §13377; the General Permit, the Regional Water Board Basin Plan, the California Toxics Rule (CTR) 40 C.F.R. § 131.38, and California Code of Regulations, Title 22, § 64431.

## **II. THE LOCATION OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS**

### **A. The Facility**

The location of the point sources from which the pollutants identified in this Notice are discharged in violation of the CWA is Core-Mark International’s permanent facility address of 31300 Medallion Drive in Hayward, California.

Core-Mark International Facility is an establishment engaged in the transportation of goods. Facility operations are covered under Standard Industrial Classification Code (SIC)

4213- Trucking, Except Local.

Based on the EPA's Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet for Sector P – Transportation Facilities, polluted discharges from operations at the Facility potentially contain pH affecting substances; heavy metals, arsenic, ethylene glycol, total suspended solids, benzene; gasoline and diesel fuels; fuel additives; coolants; and oil and grease. Many of these pollutants are on the list of chemicals published by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects, and/or developmental or reproductive harm.

Information available to EDEN indicates that the Facility's industrial activities and associated materials are exposed to storm water, and that each of the substances listed on the EPA's Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet is a potential source of pollutants at the Facility.

#### **B. The Affected Receiving Waters**

The Facility discharges into a municipal storm drain system, which then discharges to the Alameda Creek, a tributary of the San Francisco Bay ("Receiving Waters").

The San Francisco Bay is a water of the United States. The CWA requires that water bodies such as the San Francisco Bay meet water quality objectives that protect specific "beneficial uses." The Regional Water Board has issued the *San Francisco Bay Basin Water Quality Control Plan* ("Basin Plan") to delineate those water quality objectives.

The Basin Plan identifies the "Beneficial Uses" of water bodies in the region. The Beneficial Uses for the Receiving Waters downstream of the Facility include: commercial and sport fishing, estuarine habitat, fish migration, navigation, preservation of rare and endangered species, water contact and noncontact recreation, shellfish harvesting, fish spawning, and wildlife habitat. Contaminated storm water from the Facility adversely affects the water quality of the San Francisco Bay watershed and threatens the beneficial uses and ecosystem of this watershed.

Furthermore, the San Francisco Bay is listed for water quality impairment on the most recent 303(d)-list for the following: chlordane; dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT); dieldrin; dioxin compounds (including 2,3,7,8- tetrachlorodibenzo-pdioxin); furan compounds; invasive species; mercury; polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs); PCBs (dioxin-like); selenium, and trash.

Polluted storm water and non-storm water discharges from industrial facilities, such as the Facility, contribute to the further degradation of already impaired surface waters, and harm aquatic dependent wildlife.

### **III. VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND GENERAL PERMIT**

#### **A. Late Reapplication for NPDES Coverage**

The CWA prohibits storm water discharges without a permit. 33 U.S.C. § 1342; 40 C.F.R. § 122.26. The General Permit regulates operators of facilities subject to coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water permit, as these operators discharge storm water associated with specific industrial activities identified by both industrial activity and SIC (Standard Industrial Classification) codes in Attachment A of the Permit.

Core-Mark International's primary industrial activity is listed on Attachment A as an industrial activity subject to NPDES coverage. Thus, the Facility was required to apply for coverage under the Permit in order to commence business operations, pursuant to Section I.Q of the Permit.

According to California Secretary of State records, Core-Mark International commenced its operations at the site on or before September 25, 1995.

Core-Mark International was covered under the 1997 Industrial General Order, which expired on June 30, 2015, and was replaced by the 2014 Industrial General Permit, which became effective on July 1, 2015. In order to continue regulatory coverage under the new Permit, all Dischargers were required to complete a recertification process on or before August 14, 2015. Notwithstanding that the Regional Water Board issued two separate Notices of Noncompliance to the Facility, Core-Mark International failed to recertify for General Permit coverage and was terminated from the program, effective August 15, 2015.

Core-Mark International did not in fact re-apply for coverage until January 7, 2016. Thus, between at least August 15, 2015 and January 7, 2016, the Facility operated without NPDES Permit coverage. During that time, the Facility did not comply with any of the terms of the Permit, including implementing Best Management Practices, collecting and analyzing storm water runoff for pollution parameters, preparing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, or filing Annual Reports.

Permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act and the Water Code, is grounds for enforcement action against the Facility and is further a violation of Sections I. and II.B.1.b. of the General Permit.

#### **B. Deficient/Invalid SWPPP and Site Map**

Core-Mark International's current Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") and Site Map for the Facility are both inadequate and fail(s) to comply with the requirements

of the General Permit as specified in Section X of Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, as follows:

- (a) The Site Map does not include the minimum required components for Site Maps as indicated in Section X.E of the General Permit. Specifically, the Site Map fails to include the following:
  - 1) locations and descriptions of structural control measures that affect industrial storm water discharges, authorized NSWDS and/or run-on, if any;
  - 2) all areas of industrial activity subject to the General Permit.
- (b) The SWPPP does not indicate the **Facility name and contact information** (Section X.A.1);
- (c) The SWPPP omits the **date that it was initially prepared** (Section X.A.10);
- (d) The SWPPP fails to include the **date of each SWPPP Amendment** (Section X.A.10);
- (e) The SWPPP is invalid because it was **not certified and submitted by the Facility's Legally Responsible Person**. In fact, the SWPPP was not certified by anyone. Pursuant to Section XII.K of the General Permit, all Permit Registration Documents (PRDs), including SWPPPs, must be certified and submitted by the Facility's authorized Legally Responsible Person;
- (f) The SWPPP fails to document the facility's **scheduled operating hours**, including irregular operating hours (i.e. temporary, intermittent, seasonal, weather dependent) (Section X.D.2.d);
- (g) The SWPPP fails to include an appropriate discussion of the **Industrial Materials** handled at the facility, including the locations where the materials are stored, received, shipped and handled, and the quantities and handling frequency of the Industrial Materials (Sections X.A.3, X.F, X.G.1.a);
- (h) The SWPPP fails to discuss in detail **Facility operations and all industrial processes** at the facility, including manufacturing, cleaning, maintenance, recycling, disposal, and any other activities related to each industrial process; and the type, characteristics, and approximate quantity of industrial materials used in or resulting from the process. Areas protected by containment structures and the corresponding containment capacity are also required to be identified and described. (X.G.1.a);
- (i) The SWPPP fails to include an adequate description of **Potential Pollutant Sources**

- and narrative assessment of all areas of industrial activity with potential industrial pollutant sources, including Industrial Processes, Material Handling and Storage Areas, Dust and Particulate Generating Activities, Significant Spills and Leaks, Non-Storm Water Discharges and Erodible Surfaces (Section X.G);
- (j) The **Minimum Best Management Practices** (BMPs) as indicated in the SWPPP are insufficient and do not comply with the minimum required categories as listed in the General Permit, which include Good Housekeeping, Preventive Maintenance, Spill and Leak Prevention and Response, Material Handling and Waste Management, Erosion and Sediment Controls, Employee Training Program and Quality Assurance and Record Keeping (Section X.H.1);
  - (k) The **Advanced BMPs** as identified in the SWPPP are inadequate to comply with the Best Available Technology (“BAT”) and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (“BCT”) requirements of the General Permit to reduce or prevent discharges of pollutants in the Facility’s storm water discharge in a manner that reflects best industry practice, considering technological availability and economic practicability and achievability, including Exposure Minimization BMPs, Storm Water Containment and Discharge Reduction BMPs or Treatment Control BMPs (Section X.H.2);
  - (l) The SWPPP fails to include a **BMP Summary Table** summarizing each identified area of industrial activity, the associated industrial pollutant sources, the industrial pollutants and the BMPs being implemented (Section X.H.4 and X.H.5);
  - (m) The SWPPP fails to identify all **Non-Storm Water Discharges (NSWDs)** sources and drainage areas, including an evaluation of all drains (inlets and outlets) that identifies connections to the storm water conveyance system, and a description of how all unauthorized NSWDs have been eliminated (Section X.G.e);
  - (n) The SWPPP fails to include an appropriate **Monitoring Implementation Plan**, including an identification of team members assigned to conduct monitoring requirements, a description of all discharge locations, a discussion of Visual Observation procedures, justifications for alternative discharge locations, if any, procedures for field instrument calibration instructions, and an example Chain of Custody form to be used when handling and shipping water quality samples to the lab (Section X.I);
  - (o) The SWPPP fails to include an adequate discussion of the **Facility’s receiving waters** (Section XI.B.6(e), Section X.G.2.ix);
  - (p) The SWPPP does not contain the proper **sampling parameters** for the Facility’s SIC Code (Section XI.B.6.d, Table 1, Section XI);

- (q) The SWPPP does not contain the proper **sampling parameters** that include all potential pollutants present at the facility due to its industrial operations and industrial materials present at the facility (Section XI.B.6);
- (r) The SWPPP does not contain the proper **sampling frequency information** (Section XI.B);
- (s) The SWPPP fails to include an appropriate discussion of **drainage areas and Outfalls** from which samples must be taken during Qualified Storm Events (Section XI);
- (t) The SWPPP fails to include in the SWPPP detailed information about its **Pollution Prevention Team** (Section X.D); and
- (u) The SWPPP fails to discuss the **Annual Comprehensive Facility Compliance Evaluation** (Section X.A.9).

Failure to develop or implement an adequate SWPPP is a violation of Sections II.B.4.f and X of the General Permit.

***C. Failure to Develop, Implement and/or Revise an Adequate Monitoring and Reporting Program Pursuant to the General Permit***

Section XI of the General Permit requires Dischargers to develop and implement a storm water monitoring and reporting program ("M&RP") prior to conducting industrial activities. Dischargers have an ongoing obligation to revise the M&RP as necessary to ensure compliance with the General Permit.

The objective of the M&RP is to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility's discharge, and to ensure compliance with the General Permit's Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. An adequate M&RP ensures that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the Facility, and it must be evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the General Permit.

***1. Failure to Conduct Visual Observations***

Section XI(A) of the General Permit requires all Dischargers to conduct visual observations at least once each month, and sampling observations at the same time sampling occurs at a discharge location.



Observations must document the presence of any floating and suspended material, oil and grease, discolorations, turbidity, odor and the source of any pollutants. Dischargers must document and maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations observed, and responses taken to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges.

EDEN believes that between July 1, 2015, and the present, Core-Mark International has failed to conduct monthly and sampling visual observations pursuant to Section XI(A) of the General Permit.

2. Failure to Collect and Analyze the Required Number of Storm Water Samples

In addition, EDEN alleges that Core-Mark International has failed to provide the Regional Water Board with the minimum number of annual documented results of Facility run-off sampling as required under Sections XI.B.2 and XI.B.11.a of Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, in violation of the General Permit and the CWA.

Section XI.B.2 of the General Permit requires that all Dischargers collect and analyze storm water samples from two Qualifying Storm Events (“QSEs”) within the first half of each reporting year (July 1 to December 31), and two (2) QSEs within the second half of each reporting year (January 1 to June 30).

Section XI.C.6.b provides that if samples are not collected pursuant to the General Permit, an explanation must be included in the Annual Report.

As of the date of this Notice, Core-Mark International has failed to upload into the SMARTS database system *any* storm water sample analyses for samples collected during the reporting years 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 to date.

**D. Late-Filed Annual Reports**

Core-Mark International has failed to comply with Section XVI.A of the General Permit, which provides as follows: “The Discharger shall certify and submit via SMARTS an Annual Report no later than July 15th following each reporting year using the standardized format and checklists in SMARTS.”

Core-Mark International’s Annual Reports for the reporting years 2015-16 and 2016-17 were due on or before July 15, 2016 and July 15, 2017. However, the Facility failed to file the Annual Report for 2016 until December 8, 2017; and the Report for 2017 until December 18, 2017.

**E. Deficient BMP Implementation**

Sections I.C, V.A and X.C.1.b of the General Permit require Dischargers to identify and implement minimum and advanced Best Management Practices (“BMPs”) that comply with the

Best Available Technology (“BAT”) and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (“BCT”) requirements of the General Permit to reduce or prevent discharges of pollutants in their storm water discharge in a manner that reflects best industry practice, considering technological availability and economic practicability and achievability.

EDEN alleges that Core-Mark International has been conducting industrial activities at the site without adequate BMPs to prevent resulting non-storm water discharges. Non-storm water discharges resulting from these activities are not from sources that are listed among the authorized non-storm water discharges in the General Permit, and thus are always prohibited.

Core-Mark International’s failure to develop and/or implement adequate BMPs and pollution controls to meet BAT and BCT at the Facility violates and will continue to violate the CWA and the Industrial General Permit each day the Facility discharges storm water without meeting BAT and BCT.

**F. Discharges in Violation of the General Permit**

Except as authorized by Special Conditions of the General Permit, Discharge Prohibition III(B) prohibits permittees from discharging materials other than storm water (non-storm water discharges) either directly or indirectly to waters of the United States. Unauthorized non-storm water discharges must be either eliminated or permitted by a separate NPDES permit.

Information available to EDEN indicates that unauthorized non-storm water discharges occur at the Facility due to inadequate BMP development and/or implementation necessary to prevent these discharges.

EDEN alleges that the Discharger has discharged storm water containing excessive levels of pollutants from the Facility to its Receiving Waters during at least every significant local rain event over 0.1 inches in the last five (5) years.

EDEN hereby puts the Discharger on notice that each time the Facility discharges prohibited non-storm water in violation of Discharge Prohibition III.B of the General Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the General Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a).

**G. Failure to Comply with the Mandates of the Regional Water Board**

Pursuant to Section XIX of the General Permit, Regional Water Boards have general authority to enforce the provisions and requirements of the General Permit, including reviewing SWPPPs, Monitoring Implementation Plans, ERA Reports, and Annual Reports and requiring Dischargers to revise and re-submit PRDs, conducting compliance inspections, and taking enforcement actions.

The Regional Water Board has issued the Facility five or more Notices of Non-Compliance (NNC) letters. This pattern of negligence shows continued and ongoing disregard for compliance of the General Permit and for the Regional Water Board's mandates.

**H. Failure to Properly Train Employees/Facility Pollution Prevention Team**

Section X.D.1 of the General Permit requires each Facility to establish a Pollution Prevention Team responsible for assisting with the implementation of the requirements of the General Permit. The Facility is also required to identify alternate team members to implement the SWPPP and conduct required monitoring when the regularly assigned Pollution Prevention Team members are temporarily unavailable (due to vacation, illness, out of town business, or other absences).

Section X.H.f of the General Permit also requires that each Facility ensure that all Pollution Prevention Team members implementing the various compliance activities of the General Permit are properly trained in at least the following minimum requirements: BMP implementation, BMP effectiveness evaluations, visual observations, and monitoring activities. Further, if a Facility enters Level 1 status, appropriate team members must be trained by a QISP.

Based on the foregoing violations, it is clear that Core-Mark International has either not properly established its Pollution Prevention Team, or has not adequately trained its Pollution Prevention Team, in violation of Sections X.D.1 and X.H.f of the General Permit.

Core-Mark International may have had other violations that can only be fully identified and documented once discovery and investigation have been completed. Hence, to the extent possible, EDEN includes such violations in this Notice and reserves the right to amend this Notice, if necessary, to include such further violations in future legal proceedings.

**IV. THE PERSON OR PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE VIOLATIONS**

The entities responsible for the alleged violations are Core-Mark International and RREEF Management LLC/31300 Medallion Drive CA LP, as well as employees of the Facility responsible for compliance with the CWA.

**V. THE DATE, DATES, OR REASONABLE RANGE OF DATES OF THE VIOLATIONS**

The range of dates covered by this 60-day Notice is from at least July 1, 2014, to the date of this Notice. EDEN may from time to time update this Notice to include all violations which may occur after the range of dates covered by this Notice. Some of the violations are continuous in nature; therefore, each day constitutes a violation.

## VI. CONTACT INFORMATION

The entity giving this 60-day Notice is Eden Environmental Citizen's Group ("EDEN").

Aiden Sanchez  
EDEN ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZEN'S GROUP  
2151 Salvio Street #A2-319  
Concord, CA 94520  
Telephone: (925) 732-0960  
Email: [Edenenvcitizens@gmail.com](mailto:Edenenvcitizens@gmail.com) (emailed correspondence is preferred)  
Website: edenenvironmental.org

EDEN has retained counsel in this matter as follows:

CRAIG A. BRANDT  
Attorney at Law  
5354 James Avenue  
Oakland CA, 94618  
Telephone: (510) 601-1309  
Email: [craigabrandt@att.net](mailto:craigabrandt@att.net)

To ensure proper response to this Notice, all communications should be addressed to EDEN's legal counsel, Mr. Craig A. Brandt.

## VII. RELIEF SOUGHT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

CWA §§ 505(a)(1) and 505(f) provide for citizen enforcement actions against any "person," including individuals, corporations, or partnerships, for violations of NPDES permit requirements and for un-permitted discharges of pollutants. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1365(a)(1) and (f), §1362(5).

Pursuant to Section 309(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d), and the Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation, 40 C.F.R. § 19.4, each separate violation of the Clean Water Act subjects the violator to a penalty for all violations occurring during the period commencing five (5) years prior to the date of the Notice Letter. **These provisions of law authorize civil penalties of \$37,500.00 per day per violation for all Clean Water Act violations after January 12, 2009, and \$51,570.00 per day per violation for violations that occurred after November 2, 2015.**

In addition to civil penalties, EDEN will seek injunctive relief preventing further violations of the Clean Water Act pursuant to Sections 505(a) and (d), 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a) and (d), declaratory relief, and such other relief as permitted by law.

**Lastly, pursuant to Section 505(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(d) and California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, EDEN will seek to recover its pre and post-litigation costs, including all attorneys' and experts' fees and costs incurred** (see *Southern California Alliance of Publicly Owned Treatment Works v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency* (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2017) 853 F.3d 1076; *Vasquez v. State of California* (2008) 45 Cal.4th 243).

#### VIII. CONCLUSION

The CWA specifically provides a 60-day notice period to promote resolution of disputes. EDEN encourages Core-Mark International's counsel to contact **EDEN's counsel** within 20 days of receipt of this Notice to initiate a discussion regarding the violations detailed herein. Please do not contact EDEN directly.

During the 60-day notice period, EDEN is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations; however, if Core-Mark International wishes to pursue such discussions in the absence of litigation, it is suggested those discussions be initiated soon so that they may be completed before the end of the 60-day notice period. EDEN reserves the right to file a lawsuit if discussions are continuing when the notice period ends.

Very truly yours,



AIDEN SANCHEZ  
Eden Environmental Citizen's Group

#### Copies to:

Andrew Wheeler: [wheeler.andrew@Epa.gov](mailto:wheeler.andrew@Epa.gov)  
Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection  
Agency

State Water Resources Control Board  
Eileen Sobeck, Executive Director  
[eileen.sobeck@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:eileen.sobeck@waterboards.ca.gov)

Mayumi Okamoto, Office of Enforcement:  
[Mayumi.Okamoto@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Mayumi.Okamoto@waterboards.ca.gov)  
[stormwater@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:stormwater@waterboards.ca.gov)

Regional Administrator, U.S. EPA – Region 9  
Jennifer Pierce: [pierce.jennifer@epa.gov](mailto:pierce.jennifer@epa.gov)  
Laurie Kermish: [kermish.Laurie@epa.gov](mailto:kermish.Laurie@epa.gov)